

REMARKS

Applicant received an Office Communication mailed September 27, 2006, in which the Examiner found Applicant's Amendment (hereinafter "Amendment") filed in response to the Office Action mailed April 13, 2006 to be non-responsive. Applicant was given one month to more fully respond to the Office Action by pointing out the specific distinctions that are believed to render the claims patentable over the applied references.

Amendment

Applicant has amended independent claim 299 to correct an informality. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Responsiveness of the Amendment

Applicant respectfully believes that the submitted Amendment was fully responsive to the Office Action mailed September 27, 2006. 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) states that, to be fully responsive, "[t]he reply must present arguments pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims, including any newly presented claims, patentable over any applied references." The new independent claims presented in the Amendment contained combinations of elements to which the Examiner had yet to apply any prior art reference. Because no prior art reference, or references when combined, had been cited as disclosing or suggesting the combination of elements presented in the independent claims, Applicant's general statements to the effect that the claims were allowable in view of the prior art of record was a valid response. As a result, Applicant believes that the Amendment was fully responsive to the Office Action.

Supplemental Discussion of the New Claims

Independent claim 272 describes an identification card printer that includes a ribbon cartridge having a cleaner roller and a card cleaner roller having a debris-collecting surface that engages a debris-collecting surface of the cleaner roller and removes debris from a surface of a card fed along a print path. The Examiner has yet to apply any reference to this particular

combination of elements or to the claimed card cleaner roller. Applicant intended to point this fact out by reference to claim 85 in the Amendment that was indicated as being allowable. Accordingly, Applicant has no comment to make with regard to the references cited thus far except that they do not disclose or suggest all of the elements of claim 272 and, more particularly, they do not disclose or suggest the card cleaner roller. Therefore, Applicant believes that claim 272 and its dependent claims are allowable in view of the art of record.

Independent claim 291 includes a loader program stored in a tangible medium and executable by the controller, the loader program configured to decrypt and load encrypted firmware upgrades into the memory. The Examiner has yet to apply any reference to this claimed element. Applicant intended to point this out by reference to claim 58, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. None of the references disclose or suggest the claimed loader program either alone or in combination with the other elements of claim 291. Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claim 291 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 293 includes a printhead configured to print an image on a surface of the card using the supply of print ribbon, wherein the printhead is movable between a print position, in which print elements are positioned adjacent the print path for printing on the surface of the card, an idle position in which the print elements are lowered relative to the print position, and a full-down position in which the print head is lowered relative to the idle position. The Examiner has yet to apply any reference to this claimed element. Applicant intended to point this out by reference to claim 72, which the Examiner indicated as being in condition for allowance. None of the references disclose or suggest the claimed printhead either alone or in combination with the other elements of claim 293. Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claim 293 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 299 includes a supply circuit mounted to the ribbon cartridge, the supply circuit including a memory containing supply information that has been encrypted; a supply circuit reader configured to communicate with the supply circuit; and a controller configured to access the supply information using the supply circuit reader and to decrypt the supply information. The Examiner has yet to apply any reference to the combination of these elements. Additionally, the Examiner has yet to apply a prior art reference or references that disclose or suggest the controller of claim 299. Furthermore, none of the cited references are believed to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 299. Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claim 299 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Although the Examiner has never applied Squires et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0128269 A1) to the elements of claim 299, Applicant predicted in the Amendment that the Examiner would attempt to use the reference as disclosing the claimed controller based on the manner in which it was applied to previously submitted claims 29 and 30. However, Applicant believes that Squires et al. is disqualified as prior art to the present application for the reasons set forth in the Amendment. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 299 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 311 is directed to an identification card printer that includes a ribbon cartridge containing a supply of print ribbon; a supply circuit mounted to the ribbon cartridge, the supply circuit including a memory containing supply information including a value; a supply circuit reader configured to communicate with the supply circuit; and a controller configured to access the supply information using the supply circuit reader and to adjust the value based on use of the print ribbon. The Examiner has yet to apply any reference to the combination of these elements. Additionally, the Examiner has yet to apply a prior art reference or references that disclose or suggest the claimed supply circuit and the controller that adjusts the value in the memory based on use of the print ribbon. Furthermore, none of the prior art of record is believed to disclose or suggest the elements of claim 311. Therefore, Applicant believes that independent claim 311 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Although the Examiner has never applied Squires et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0128269 A1) to the elements of claim 311, Applicant predicted that the Examiner would attempt to use the reference as disclosing the claimed supply circuit and controller based on the manner in which it was applied to previously submitted claims 34 and 149. In the Amendment, Applicant intended to point this out and argued that Squires et al. should not be used in a subsequent Office Action to reject claim 311 because it is believed to be disqualified as prior art to the claim.

Conclusion


In view of the above comments and remarks, Applicant believes that the Amendment was fully responsive to the Office Action mailed April 13, 2006.

Additionally, Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Brian D. Kaul, Reg. No. 41,885
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

BDK/djb